



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

and similar words, in which the reference is to the constellations of those names, are doubtless omitted because they are regarded as proper names, which are not included in the lexicon. In that case it is difficult to see why *Catamitus* (p. 100) is printed with a capital.

The omission of all etymologies, as well as of any information about forms, except so far as the latter can be drawn from the examples, is probably due to considerations of space. It is less easy to justify the omission of all marks of quantity, since to give them would have required no additional room. The list of works cited seems to be incomplete, since it does not contain H IV, a (= *Aratea*), from which an example is given under *cate*. On p. 95, l. 3, *canse* is printed for *canes*, and on p. 139 *coflictio* for *conflictio*.

The work is well and clearly printed, and it is gratifying to be informed that all the manuscript is in the printer's hands, and that the completion of this welcome addition to our list of special lexicons may be looked for within the year.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

*Criticisms and Elucidations of Catullus.* By H. A. J. MUNRO.

Second edition. London: Bell, 1905. Pp. xii+250. \$2.50 net.

Good wine needs no bush, and Munro's well-known book no additional commendation to that which the first edition so bountifully received. It has served for the stimulation of now a whole generation of students of Catullus, in spite of the fact that few of Munro's emendations of the text have been accepted by other scholars. The book has long been out of print, and will find a hearty welcome in its reissue, which was perhaps prompted by the desire to compete with a recent mechanical reproduction of the *Criticisms* along with the same author's *Aetna*.

The new edition differs from its predecessor only by including three short articles contributed by the author to the *Journal of Philology* after the publication of his book. The reader who wishes to find them, however, may feel inclined to utter a brief malediction upon the editor of the new edition, who omits to state what, or where, they are. The first, on Cat. 63. 18 (p. 143), proposes to read *hilarate procitatis* for *hilarate erocitatis* of cod. O (*crocitatis* G), citing Phil. Gloss. *procitat*, *προεκκαλείται*, and Paul. Fest. 225. 7. The emendation will hardly find acceptance. *Procitatis* is palaeographically less probable than *erecitatis* (= *erae citatis*), and *citatis* chimes in excellently with the other words expressing excited swiftness that abound in this poem.

The second note is on 64. 276 (p. 150), where Munro would read *uestis ubi* [sc. *erat*?] for *uestibuli*, criticizing Ellis' rendering of "the shelter of the royal porch" on the ground that the *uestibulum* was an unroofed fore-court. Ellis, in the second edition of his *Commentary*, did not

mention Munro's emendation, though he apparently laid the criticism to heart, changing his version to "the inclosure of the royal vestibule," and explaining *tecta* as "the buildings which made up the *uestibulum*, a spacious court from which the palace was entered." But both Munro and Ellis may perhaps be wrong in their notion of what Catullus had in mind as a *uestibulum* (Munro apparently depends on Marquardt). The poet was no archaeologist, but he doubtless knew that a Roman *uestibulum* might be, in whole or in part, a roofed portico running along the front of a house. Witness, for example, the construction of the so-called House of the Vestals in Pompeii (Strada Consolare), before its rebuilding, and the entrance portico of some of the early Roman churches. The transfer of epithet in 64. 276 is of course amply justified by such phrases as *Lydiae lacus undae* (31. 13), and *domus tecta paterna* (64. 248); and the text needs no emendation, and no such explanation as Ellis<sup>2</sup> gives. But suppose it did—could anyone but Munro believe that Catullus wrote such a banal thing as *sic tum, uestis ubi, linquentes*, etc.?

Munro's third note is on 107. 7 (p. 219), where he would read *aut magis aeuum | optandum hac uita ducere quis poterit*, a suggestion not sufficiently defended by his belief that this passage is directly imitated in *Culex* 79, nor yet by his palaeographical explanation.

But when all is said and done, Munro's book is an indispensable aid to students of Catullus, though possessors of the first edition need not feel too conscience-stricken if they do not buy the second for the sake of these three notes.

E. T. M.

---

*Evidence in Athenian Courts.* By ROBERT J. BONNER. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1905. Pp. 98. \$0.75 net.

The purpose of this work, as stated by the author, is to deal with the whole subject of evidence in the courts of ancient Athens from the standpoint of English law, and most admirably has that intention been carried out. Dr. Bonner's knowledge of English legal procedure has stood him in good stead.

Only one who is both a Grecian and a lawyer could have treated the rules of evidence in Athenian courts so vividly and sympathetically, and at the same time in so thorough and scholarly a fashion.

It is true that the technical terms of the Attic law find no exact equivalent in English legal terminology, yet by the use of the latter nomenclature the subject gains, for the English reader at least, an attractiveness, a clearness, and a life which it would not otherwise possess.

For purposes of comparison and illustration this little book might well find a place in the curricula of universities and law schools in all English-speaking communities.

A. CARRUTHERS.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO.